UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Modern Unitarianism - *Curtis W. Reese*

An Open Letter to Mr. Trygve Lie - - - - - - - - *Miriam Ziony*

The Real in Religion - *Harold P. Marley*

Political Kaleidoscope in China - - - - - - - - - *John Nicholls Booth*

Free Fellowships and Communism - - - - - - - - - *Edith Hansen*

Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman - - - - - - - - - *Leonard B. Gray*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXIV NUMBER 5

Chicago, November-December, 1948

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

John Nicholls Booth: Formerly minister of The Church of All Souls, Evanston, Illinois; now on a round-the-world tour.

Leonard B. Gray: Minister of The First Congregational Church, Lynn, Massachusetts.

Edith Hansen: Daughter of a Congregational Minister; member of the Philadelphia Ethical Society.

C. A. Hawley: Head of the Department of English Literature, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas.

Gladys R. Hilton: Formerly Vice-President of the General Alliance of Unitarian Women.

Randall S. Hilton: Executive Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference.

Harold P. Marley: Formerly minister of Unitarian churches in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and Dayton, Ohio.

Curtis W. Reese: Dean of The Abraham Lincoln Centre and President of the Western Unitarian Conference.

Miriam Ziony: Social Analyst.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 79

ARTICLES—

An Open Letter to Mr. Trygve Lie—MIRIAM ZIONY 80
The Real in Religion—HAROLD P. MARLEY 81
Political Kaleidoscope in China—JOHN NICHOLLS BOOTH 83
Modern Unitarianism—CURTIS W. REESE 85
Free Fellowships and Communism—EDITH HANSEN 88
Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman—LEONARD B. GRAY 92

POETRY—

Smoke—GEOFFREY JOHNSON 91

THE STUDY TABLE—

Experience-Centered Education—GLADYS R. HILTON 93
A Guide to the Apocrypha—C. A. HAWLEY 93
Lord Acton Speaks—RANDALL S. HILTON 94

CORRESPONDENCE—

Thomas Paine Pulpit—SHERMAN D. WAKEFIELD 94

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 95

THE FIELD—

Mental Health—*Joint Bulletin of The National Mental Health Foundation, and The National Committee for Mental Hygiene* 78

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

MENTAL HEALTH

I. Extent of Mental Illness

1. Nearly 700,000 people in the United States are patients in mental hospitals.

2. Approximately 300,000 are in their communities unable to gain admittance.

3. One out of 20 fifteen-year-olds will some day be a patient in a mental hospital.

4. One out of ten persons are sufficiently sick mentally to require medical attention.

5. Fifty-three per cent of all hospital patients are in mental hospitals.

6. One-quarter of a million patients are admitted to such hospitals every year.

7. One-half of these are new cases.

8. About half the patients of general medical practitioners are suffering from nervous and emotional disorders.

9. About one-third of those admitted to general hospitals are suffering from nervous and emotional disorders.

10. One out of eight men were rejected by the armed forces for neuropsychiatric reasons.

11. About one-third of the medical discharges from the armed forces were for neuropsychiatric reasons.

12. A large percentage of the cases calling for special attention by social agencies, courts and public schools are handicapped by mental disorder or defect.

II. Facilities Are Inadequate

1. Mental hospitals throughout the United States are over-crowded about 10 per cent on the average. Many much more seriously.

2. Ninety-seven per cent of hospitalized mental patients are in tax-supported hospitals.

3. Most communities in the United States have no psychiatric clinics.

4. Personnel cannot be trained fast enough to meet hospital and clinic needs.

5. Funds available for the maintenance and treatment of mental patients do not provide adequate housing, food, clothing, and other necessities.

(Continued on page 93)

UNITY

Volume CXXXIV NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1948 No. 5

EDITORIAL

Before the next issue of UNITY is out, the Board of Directors of the American Unitarian Association will have nominated a candidate for election in May to the Presidency of the Association. At this writing it is not generally known whether Dr. Frederick M. Eliot is a candidate for nomination to succeed himself. The three terms of President Eliot have been stormy, but in many ways distinguished. Opposition to a fourth term has arisen from three chief sources. A small group of extreme reactionaries, represented by the Committee of Fourteen and to a lesser extent by certain so-called Unitarian Christians, regard Dr. Eliot as dangerously radical socially and too liberal theologically. Another group, representing the extreme left politically, regard him as not sufficiently aggressive in opposition to the reactionaries. Neither of these groups is sufficiently large or weighty to constitute formidable opposition; and, besides, they both fail to comprehend the real meaning of a liberal fellowship and the proper function of the president of a free church movement. The third group represents genuine and outstanding liberals of both the right and the left theologically, whose opposition is not based on either theological or political considerations, but is the result of the cumulative effect of innumerable irritations growing out of numerous controversies of an administrative nature. So formidable is the opposition of this third group that the Board of Directors of the Association is making an unusual effort to determine the will of the Fellowship. It should be evident that in the selection of a President of the Association certain principles should be rigidly adhered to. Among them are these: First, no man should be President who would give priority to any particular theological norm in representing the Fellowship to the public or in his organizational functioning. Second, no man should be President who cannot rise above personalities and controversies, and judge issues and persons on merit alone. Third, no man should be President who is temperamentally incapable of practicing the art of compromise in procedural matters. Fourth, no man should be President who does not have a vision of Unitarianism as a Church Universal rising above and going beyond the limitations of the sects of Christendom and the religions of the world. Fifth, no man should be President who does not in his own person combine the virtues of spiritual insight and administrative competence. Under leadership conforming to these principles, a vitalized and aggressive American Unitarian Movement could march forward like an army with banners. The Nominating Board has a grave responsibility and it should act with deliberation and foresight.

Curtis W. Reese.

An Open Letter to Mr. Trygve Lie

MIRIAM ZIONY

Not so many months ago, Mr. Lie, in your capacity as Secretary General of the United Nations, you took it upon yourself to "remind" the United States regarding the rights of two foreign UN newspaper correspondents who were being held in custody by our immigration authorities. Your reminder in reference to those two correspondents, who had been accused of various misrepresentations and Communist leanings, has helped to clarify the procedures, as well as the rights and responsibilities, entailed in accrediting representatives at United Nations conferences.

There is another, far more urgent and more vital matter—the Palestine partition program and the promise to the Jews—about which you would do well, Mr. Lie, as Secretary General of the United Nations, to broadcast some reminders without further delay or equivocation. The truce negotiations in Palestine, with all due regard to the sincerity of the late Count Folke Bernadotte, have become a snare and a delusion.

There is immediate need for some reminders to the member nations of the United Nations, if their membership holds any meaning for them, if there is any honor left among the international manipulators of confusion and evil, and among those who have been rendering only lip service to their good intentions.

1. A reminder that the Jewish State is neither an illicit nor a subversive enterprise. Its establishment was approved and authorized under Article 18 of the Charter of the United Nations. The vote was taken; the decision was made—more than a year ago. A number of the members of the United Nations have already given official recognition to the new Israel and to its proclamation of sovereignty and independence. There is nothing in the Charter or in the Partition Plan that authorizes the United Nations to reconsider or to rescind its decisions, or to substitute trusteeships or truces or anything else, even temporarily.

2. A reminder to *all* the members that repudiation of the promise to the Jews will help to dig the grave and nail the coffin of any remaining hopes for world peace and international justice as inevitably as the betrayals of Manchuria and Ethiopia and Albania, of Czechoslovakia and Austria, of Poland and Finland and the Baltic States doomed the League of Nations to failure and forecast the second World War.

3. A reminder to those who say that the United States coerced some countries into voting for partition. On the contrary, if false rumors had not been spread so assiduously to the effect that Russia was sending Communists to Palestine disguised as refugees, some of the countries which at the last minute refrained from voting or voted in the negative, would have come out in favor of the Jewish State in accordance with their previously well-known sympathy toward Zionism.

4. A reminder to the Soviets and their satellites that, if by their sudden change in the Party line in behalf of the Jews they think to make Palestine a stepping stone to their ambitions for Communist enslavement of the Holy Land and the Middle East, they may, instead, suddenly find themselves at the bottom of the sea, as did once an ancient tyrant and his satellites.

5. A reminder to the United States and to Great Britain, particularly, that the Plan of Partition as approved by more than the required two-thirds majority in the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 29, 1947, provides for "an armed militia" to be set up by the Jewish State through its Provisional Council of Government, "to maintain internal order and to prevent frontier clashes." To submit Jewish groups to ignominious search and seizure of "contraband" arms at the same time that shipment of arms, warplanes, and other war materials has been permitted for use directly and indirectly by lawless Arab groups against the Jews has been a condonation of lawlessness, as well as an invitation to lawlessness, and a flagrant violation of the partition decision of the United Nations. The British said some months ago that they would continue to supply the Arab States with arms "to fulfill treaty obligations," unless and until the United Nations decides that Britain has acted illegally. It is about time, Mr. Secretary General, for you to remind the British that even though they did not themselves vote in favor of partition they have an obligation, as members of the United Nations, to uphold and abide by the decisions of the UN majority—*for* partition and *for* the creation of the Jewish State.

6. A reminder to Great Britain that *more* than "neutrality" and "impartiality" is required of her even though she has moved out of her mandate. This crucial period in the Holy Land calls for an exhibition of true statesmanship in the highest British tradition. The Mandatory power (Great Britain), it is explicitly stated in the Plan of Partition as approved by the United Nations through its General Assembly at Lake Success over a year ago, "shall use its endeavors to ensure that an area situated in the territory of the Jewish State, including a seaport and hinterland adequate to provide facilities for a substantial immigration, shall be evacuated at the earliest possible date and in any event not later than February 1, 1948"; and "shall not take any action to prevent, obstruct or delay the implementation by the Commission of the measures recommended by the General Assembly" for partition. It is later than the British think. Their obstructive tactics of waylaying Jewish refugees and shunting them off to Cyprus at gunpoint, up to the very day of the British exodus from Palestine, their influencing of other nations *even now* to hinder the migration of homeless European Jews to the little piece of land that has at long last been voted as the home of the Jewish people, calls for strenuous protest and censure on your part, Mr. Lie, as the head of the United Nations. Even at this late date, a change of policy on the part of the British and compliance with the recommendations of the General Assembly would do much toward restoring the Zionists' faith, toward lessening the general tension, and setting an example in cooperation in the implementation of the United Nations partition plans. There is no need for any international army to enforce the partition, or even for one to enforce the peace in the Holy Land. Both the Arabs and the Jews have had enough these past thirty years of an armed occupation under the Mandate without being subjected, in the name of enforcement and

peace, to any new armies of occupation from which they might not be able to extricate themselves for another twenty-five or thirty years. There is much need for some honesty and trustworthiness on the part of Britain, and especially her Labor Government leaders, who would do well at this time to reread some of their own Labor Party platform statements of principle on Palestine as they were proclaimed in the days *before* the Labor Government came into power.

7. A reminder to the Arab nations and to the Arab League that the peace and integrity of the Middle East and the future of the United Nations as a force for world brotherhood and peace rests in their hands. If they are prepared to abide by the majority decision for partition and will undertake to hold in check the troublemakers in their midst, instead of being misled by those who would thrive on the creation of chaos and confusion, there need be no further war, no further death and destruction, and no international armies quartered in the Holy Land. King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia and King Abdullah of Trans-Jordan have at various times been quoted as saying that they would abide by the decision of the United Nations for partition. Oil and water do not mix; but the mixture of oil and the milk of human kindness, of fair dealing and justice and truth is not incompatible. There was no fighting between the Arabs and the Jews during the War; there is no reason why the peace cannot be maintained between them now. It should be remembered that one of the first gestures of the Jews after the partition vote was announced was to stretch forth their hands in faith and friendship to Great Britain and to the Arabs. Through the good offices of the Secretary General of the United Nations and with the help of Great Britain and the United States, some arrangements can still be made, as has more than once been suggested, for King Abdullah and his well-disciplined, well-equipped, British trained army to work in co-operation with the Jewish Hagannah, including the Sternists and the Irgun Zwei Leumi, many of whom were also British trained during the War, under the famous late General Wingate.

8. And to the Children of Israel, a reminder that in blood and tears, in the sacrifice of the 6,000,000 who died in the concentration camps and gas chambers of Hitler's Europe, was their land of Israel reborn. Let them now continue to hold out the hand of friendship and brotherhood that the day may come at last when the words of the prophets of Israel shall be fulfilled, when the swords shall be beaten into ploughshares and the spears into pruning hooks, when the lions among the nations shall lie down with the lambs, and none shall have cause to be afraid any more.

The Real in Religion

HAROLD P. MARLEY

It is relatively easy to pick out the unrealities in religion. A liberal could make a game of listing the beliefs and practices of traditionalism which seem to him to be utterly fantastic. But, in actuality, he would only be reviewing what to him is unreal—the things he has rejected in his climb to religious maturity. The fact still remains that these things, for many people even in an age of science, are not a test of credulity at all. They believe, because they have a psychological demand which needs to be fulfilled. What we have as basic in all religion, from the Tibetan prayer wheel to the Golden Rule, is this dependence upon the real. For religion, because of its voluntary nature, must give value for value received. If there is no obvious return to the person, there is no religion.

Assuming, therefore, that the real is the most valid thing in religion, it is our purpose to get at the nature of the real and to point out the implications for religion of the changing realities of life. If we would know religion, we should know the basic psychological needs of people, for religion has ever been identified with these. If we would know our own personal religion and keep it fresh as a spring within, we must keep handy the ingredients of reality and take deep draughts of that.

The best way to get at religion is not to approach it from the avenue of belief, called by Eustace Haydon the curse of Christianity, but to come at it from the standpoint of performance. What does it do? We do not ask a man what he believes, but what he does. We do not even ask him what he does, but we watch to see what he does when he thinks no one is looking. We do not do our looking on holy days in the Big House with the gothic portals, but, if possible, we enter the backdoor of his dwelling. Conduct always involves people—people in action. Where there are people, there you can look for religion, and only then. When the churches are emptied, and the congregations go home, there is no religion left in the sanctuary. It is this ambulatory nature of religion (as practiced by young Francis of Assisi) which has kept it healthy.

By characterizing religion as conduct, we are given a plumb line with which to measure it, both on the individual level and the institutional, for the religion of the group is just as necessary to relate to the real, as is that of the person. If religion becomes over-institutionalized, remains indoors for too long a time, it becomes ritualized and bedridden. So long as it keeps on the move it is more likely to maintain a healthy-mindedness. Keeping the balance between its ceremonial and ambulatory aspects has presented so many difficulties that schism has time and again occurred. Reread the history of Protestantism sometime with this factor in mind—reread the prophets of the Old Testament. But where the conflict has been resolved, the church has been a powerful influence in life, and has provided leadership in promulgating such experiments as democracy, education, planned communities and social progress in general. It has lifted the so-called "personal gospel" to the social level and has considered the novel idea of saving the person by changing his environment. There are in the churches the "statusquotitions" who regard such "works" as heresy, but social science has upheld this aspect of applied religion. It has shown that most all of the piteous, crying social evils can and should be dealt with at their source, and, theoretically at least, the church is the one free institution in modern life which can offer a disinterested evaluation of other

institutions. It can be more than a "voice" crying in the wilderness. It can be a shouted command to the wilderness itself. Have you been struck (in H. G. Wells style) by the portentous fad of high school children in Alberta searching for relics of the dinosaur, or by the digging up of old civilizations next door to the spouting oil wells of Saudi Arabia? How easy it is to think of culture as something put away in the deep-freeze which we can bring out when we want it. Our culture, like our religion, is the thing we are doing right now. And our religion, if it is real, is more than a first cousin to this culture. These two are brothers living under the same roof.

Let us now go one step further. Back of the external act, within the person, there lies a motive. The motivating factors of conduct are very significant because they determine the act. They give both direction and duration to conduct. They are the things which give a particular act its religious characteristics—the determining genes which make the difference between the real and the artificial. To illustrate how motivation may either be creative and limitless, or legal and restrictive, take the example of two men, each performing good deeds which apparently are identical from the standpoint of that which is accomplished. Upon examination, one of them believes in the theory of reward and punishment. He habitually acts in terms of the "recording angel" principle. The other man is a free agent. His motives are not complicated by inhibitions or swayed for a consideration. He reacts to need as he would to hearing his name called out on a busy street.

It is not difficult to detect which act springs from the fertile subsoil of religious motivation. The realistic mind of Jesus made the distinction in his parables by making loving-kindness cut across the social demarcations and apply between Jew and Samaritan, and between the fortunate and "the least of these, thy brethren." The promise of a mansion in heaven in contrast to an abode in hell is an actuality for some people, but as a motivating factor in conduct it is reminiscent of the modern housing shortage. It is partly for this reason that a retreat has been sounded —we now hear of heaven and hell "on earth," a sure sign that psychology is winning out over theology. Modern pedagogy has gone further and thrown out the whole reward-punishment principle as ineffective for behavior and dangerous for character.

Proper motivation does more than merely lead to the spontaneous performance of a religious act. It is the very subsoil of personality itself. It is the key to the whole creative function of living. The functional roots which go down into the subsoil are three. All conduct stems from a trinity of imperatives—for a man must live, he must live with others, and he must live with himself. These functional phases of life, if creative, mean that the struggle to live becomes the prize of living well. The living of this life with others becomes a fraternal game of sharing good fortune and ill. The imperative of living with oneself involves a fine adjustment between the ego and the "I." Here, if you need one, is a modern trinity which is definitely more real than the Christian Trinity of the third century.

These are roots which go far down into human nature. They are fed by something more than blind faith. Faith in God becomes identified or exchanged for that infinitely more difficult thing, faith in man. For man is indeed a part of the naturalistic pattern. He both acts through nature and is acted upon by natural forces. This is not a bad thing, and I have always pitied the person who treats nature as an impostor, or as a sort of backdrop for our stage of life. Nature can be a "mother" to all those who will claim the relationship and treat her as such. She is certainly a teacher, for we see our own nature in her, and we learn from this. We are indoctrinated with aesthetics, and art becomes a prized possession. We even feel a companionship (as did Thoreau) so that we talk out loud, though no one is there to hear. We need not scramble up Mt. Palomar to be smitten by a glimpse of our expanding universe, and we need not bend over a microscope in the laboratory. At our very elbow, in the stimuli which reach our senses, there is this presence. The root does not bid leave to take from the soil. We need not strike a barter with nature for her commodities—only peel off the veneer of the artificial, and be natural.

We have said that the real in religion has to do with the social act, but in describing the motivation for this act, it has been shown that there is much more to it than mere social service. It is the very nature of life itself which is involved. There is religious satisfaction not only in the performance of the daily work, and in the doing of the things which will help people and change the environment, but also in the very essence of the life process. Something underneath is going on within the individual which is of vital importance to his individuality. He has his great outstanding and memorable moments of inspiration, but there is also the day-by-day rising and setting of one's life star.

Let us now take this challenge which we as individuals feel, and see how it can be applied to religion in its institutional form—I mean our institution, our liberal church, our local congregation. It is not necessary to dwell upon the challenge of the day which is ours. We know this—some of us resent it—but all of us would gladly do something if we knew what would be most effective. We would even risk the invectives which are hurled in the direction of those who make a try. Whatever the results, the time has come to start trying. Reality can be restored to liberalism by doing less talking and more acting. We have discussed and forumed ourselves almost to satiety. We need no moratorium on talking, but we do need to reverse the criminal procedure and announce that the words which we utter are definitely pointed to the act we are about to commit. Rhetoric should be a means to an end, and the end of all speeches and forums should be the handing out of "weapons" and the marshalling of forces. We already know what are the fundamental problems, and we have a good idea of their probable solution. But we perceive the painful slowness with which humanity moves toward solutions. Progress is not an overpowering, sudden tornado—it is a glacier. It is the simple, mass-movement sort of thing, fermented by intelligent leadership, inching along toward the open sea.

What a liberal religious group can do in such a time, beyond knowing a great deal so that we are not swallowed up by hysteria, is to begin to practice in a small way the evidence of our faith—faith in the ongoing nature of truth and as it applies to all mankind. We have an illustration in the medical missions of the Unitarian Service Committee. We have proclaimed for the world to see our faith in the supra-national nature of science. We believe in science, and we be-

lieve that it should have a free hand. We go to European countries where medical skills have fallen behind, and where equipment has been destroyed or outdated. Among these countries are our old enemies, Italy and Germany. Included, also, are Poland and Czechoslovakia, regarded by some as potential enemies. Without waiting for the One World to be finally incorporated, we proceed on the theory that, *ipso facto,* it has been already. We have in the record of our Service Committee established the further principle that people within the nations desire to be and some day will be ONE. Note our work with the French Maquis, with the Joint Anti-Fascist Committee, our non-sectarian service to Jews and Catholics. It is a tremendous publication of our faith to all mankind. It is real religion—applied.

Look, too, at the record of our local churches. They have in effect, in the architecture of the new buildings, said to the community: "This is what we believe about our tomorrow. We here put into permanent form before your eyes our faith in the functional nature of religion." Church after church has taken a risk by opening its parish hall to unpopular meetings, again saying to the citizens: "We believe in the Bill of Rights and in Constitutional guaranties of freedom. We are a free church and we say by our acts, 'let freedom ring.'"

What about individual members of our church—both laity and clergy? They, too, have acted in this spirit of tomorrow. Our Moderator, Dr. George D. Stoddard, has by his work in UNESCO and his public utterances pointed toward the hopeful aspects of the future. How easy it would have been for the president of a great university to go "academic" with his liberalism and place it in the ivory tower for the duration.

Lift up your heads, liberals. Run your colors up the mast. Practice your beliefs. It is a real religion and you are living in a realistic world where only the tangible is going to count. Be glad that you have a church with a historical expectation that you will be courageous and that you will progress.

Political Kaleidoscope in China

JOHN NICHOLLS BOOTH

Out of the welter of rumors, intrigues, charges, and countercharges, what picture of the Chinese political scene is slowly emerging?

Now, more than at any time in the last year or two, the world is asking for the answers to questions like: When will the Civil War in China terminate? What will be the fate of President Chiang Kai-shek? How will the complex political situation unravel itself in which the Communists and the reactionary Nanking government find themselves unwilling to resolve their troubles by setting up a coalition government? What will be the effect of a settlement upon the rest of the world?

To approach these questions we must review briefly some of the highlight events which have led China into its present dilemma. At the close of the Second World War the Russians and Chinese Red Armies made haste to receive the surrender of as large a quantity of Japanese war materiel as possible. The North China supplies went to these forces. This has formed a massive basic stockpile from which the Red Chinese armies have been drawing in their fight against the Nanking government. Otherwise, it has been relatively impossible, impartial observers agree, to discover that Russia has since aided the Northern Chinese either with material goods or military advice. Red China is on its own, tied to Moscow by ideology alone.

Chiang Kai-shek, similarly, received the surrendered military supplies left in the Central and Southern zones of the great Chinese territories by the defeated Nipponese. To this was added a considerable amount of American equipment. His position, from the standpoint of supplies and the occupation of strategic territory, is conceded to have been superior to that of the Communists at the beginning of the Civil War. He has had the added advantage of receiving continuous, if small, aid from the United States in the period since.

The present moment finds the scene diametrically changed. The Red Chinese forces have slowly, but with increasing tempo, wrested thousands of square miles of land from the Nanking government. Whole armies of Kuomintang troops have gone over to the Communist side. Aid from America intended for Chiang has slipped through his fingers into the welcoming arms of the enemy. Chiang's armies are on the defensive with their backs to a figurative wall. The financial structure of the nation is near disaster, despite frantic last-minute attempts at reform. The morale of the peoples and the armies is low. With growing intensity the cry is mounting for the war to be stopped and a coalition government to be set up in which both the Kuomintang and the Communists will share the leadership.

Political leaders in both camps assert that the key figure in the entire scene is Chiang Kai-shek. He alone, in his rage against Communism, will not agree to a coalition government. Even the workers and the students in Nationalist China openly remark that Chiang would rather bring the nation down in flaming ruins about his head than stop the war by having a coalition government which would include Communist leaders. So widespread is this feeling that those influential Chinese Communists with whom I have been able to have interviews, both in Hong Kong and in North China, assert that they have now reached a point where they, too, will refuse to negotiate for a coalition government and peace, until and unless the present high leaders of the Nanking government are eliminated completely from the scene.

The result is a growing cry throughout both Nationalist China and Communist China for the overthrow of Chiang Kai-shek. The Generalissimo is well aware of his precarious position. As a result, this summer, he remained in Nanking most of the time, instead of going away to Kuling for his usual extended vacation from the capital's heat (political and atmospheric). In August he dedicated his beautiful official residence on a low hill outside Nanking to the service of God, having converted part of the second floor into a chapel for Christian worship. He is putting the residence to good use since he has been afraid to live in this home outside the pro-

tection of the massive walls of the city.

The devastation and suffering caused by the war are visible everywhere. In Mukden, Manchuria, which is entirely surrounded by Red troops, the great industries lie dead, many of the factories standing silent, with smashed walls and wrecked machinery. Its two million inhabitants have dwindled to eight hundred thousand and an unestimable number of these are destitute refugees seeking haven from the war areas. I flew several hundred miles over Communist-dominated territory to see the depressing metropolis at first hand. My plane was loaded with eleven thousand pounds of rice destined not for the suffering populace but for the military troops. This is the principal use to which the Mukden airlift is being devoted although on the return journey to Peiping or Tientsin refugees are flown out.

Shanghai is a hollow memory of its former glorious self. Like a ship burning all of its interior structure in order to keep the furnaces lighted, China is selling all its material assets to keep the war going. This week the Broadway Mansions in Shanghai, one of that city's finest buildings, will be sold to buy more munitions. The Chinese are sick at heart of the whole mess.

Whatever prolongs the fratricidal conflict arouses a natural fury in the hearts of the people. Because continued United States aid keeps the ailing Kuomintang propped up enough to fight, but not to win, and gives Chiang enough political strength to hold on by his fingernails, hatred of America is growing steadily. A point is being reached where only the ruling Nanking clique is well disposed toward the United States of America. If it goes out of power, both Communists and Nationalists, under whatever new leaders are selected, will try to turn their backs on the United States. The masses of people on both sides are no longer amicably disposed toward the foreign government which keeps an unwanted war going with its money, a war which is ruining their own homeland and taking the lives of millions either in war or on the civilian starvation front.

America's position is not enviable. Morally, it is not strong since she, and not Russia, is the intervening power (by Chiang's invitation) in the affairs of another nation. One bumps into American military personnel, the rank of most of which is that of Colonel, on every street in Nanking. Militarily, America's prestige has suffered tremendous harm in the humiliating fact that, with American advisers acting in almost every department of Chiang Kai-shek's regime, the war on both the military and the civilian front is being lost to the isolated, unaided troops of the entirely Chinese Communist armies in the north. Financially, America is losing out by not pouring in enough money to cause a decisive defeat of the Red forces. And finally, evidence on every hand indicates that the United States is backing a despotic government which has no intention of accepting the olive branch of peace from any who would set up a genuinely representative government in China.

American Ambassador John Leighton Stuart explained to me why the United States is afraid to pour enough money and materiel into China to win the war for Chiang. Actually she could do that. But if American aid reached a sizeable enough proportion the U.S. fears that Russia might then step in on the side of Red China. A ruinous war could easily develop. Though Russia has kept herself morally clean as far as intervention is concerned, in this area, (where, to her advantage, her help has not been required) this is not to say that she would keep out of the picture if her ideological ally began to sink.

A high Chinese government official advised me that the Generalissimo, however, is staking his entire future on the coming elections in the United States. When they are over he may become either a political exile or, once more, the conquering militarist. His only hope lies in a Republican victory and the implementation of certain campaign promises made by men like Thomas Dewey that they will replace the current dribble of aid to China by a victory-producing avalanche of assistance. Otherwise his defeat on the battlefield is but a matter of time. His political opponents, both in Communist China and within his own areas, are preparing to oust him, by bloodshed if necessary. Only a quick and effective change in the fortunes of the country can save him.

It is no idle rumor that men high in the Kuomintang are also enlarging the hole in the dyke of the Generalissimo's fortunes. In the first admission made for publication, Marshal Li Chai-sum, implacable foe of Chiang and exiled leader of the "Kuomintang Revolutionary Committee" advised this writer that the Vice President of China, General Li Tsung-jen, and the Kuomintang General of the armies of the north, Fu Tso-yi, would cooperate with him in setting up a new government in the event of the overthrow of the present Nanking regime. It is felt that the plotting Marshal is being helped by these men, even now. The American Consulate in Hong Kong requested that I hold up the release of this information until they could confirm whether or not the Marshal had made it "off the record" without stating that it was to be so considered.

Marshal Li is the foremost of the dissidents who may succeed Generalissimo Chiang. Sensitive and kindly looking, he represents the most powerful group, aside from the Communists, which is working to overthrow Chiang. He holds no brief for the Communists but feels that any truly representative government for a united China must reckon with reality and include the Communists. They would act not as a territorial group but as a distinct political party. The Marshal's own philosophy is best characterized as liberal. He believes in a return to the basic principles enunciated by Dr. Sun Yat Sen and that these can best be realized by reforming the present Kuomintang along truly democratic lines. Li Chai-sum held the position of Governor of the rich Kwangtung Province for six years, a post now occupied by China's brilliant T. V. Soong. He also commanded the Fourth Route Army and is said to have supporters in every part of China waiting for his return. His present exile, forced by Chiang Kai-shek, might be likened to that of Dr. Sun's just before the 1912 Revolution which set up the Republic.

It is this writer's opinion that the present tragedy of China can be attributed, in part, to the inflexibility of many of its leaders. The Chinese have always been extremely individualistic and inordinately critical of one another. The best brains in the country have, too often, been unwilling to cooperate with one another. Out of this division has come death. There is race, but little national, pride. What sense of nationalism there is has been developed only in recent years.

One group of brilliant Chinese is in Hong Kong, in exile; its abilities are temporarily lost to a nation which needs them badly. Another group of Chinese braintrusters runs the Kuomintang party, and is misguidedly narrow about whom it will permit to share in the government allegedly of the people, by the people, and for

the people. A third, productive group is in Communist China and is led by two outstanding men, Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. All are working at cross purposes and tearing their once highly touted civilization to shreds. The hope for a united and productive China can only be realized when a truly democratic government is set up embracing the abilities of all these men.

The United States opposes the coalition government solution on the ground that the Communists would soon dominate such a government. The State Department supports Chiang Kai-shek, not because it is in sympathy with his police state methods or political despotism, but because he is thoroughly anti-Communist. China realizes this. The people, who want peace at any price today, surge with anger because their country is being made a political football by a despotic leader and a foreign power and they must pay for it with their own precious blood and hardwon resources.

The dilemma faced by the United States is simply this:

If she changes her foreign policy toward China, and withdraws her aid, Chiang Kai-shek's doom is sealed. The war would end. Peace and reconstruction could then begin. But would it be under a government dominated by the Communists as their special prerogative for winning military victory? Could a genuinely representative coalition government be set up? Or should she, the United States, continue to give an admittedly undemocratic regime her support, further increasing the hostility of the Chinese masses toward America, but thereby keeping a non-Communist foot on Asiatic shores? This policy could conceivably, sooner or later, bring Russia actively into the struggle.

Politically, it is a difficult decision to make. Morally, if we believe in self-determination and representative government, the answer is clear.

Modern Unitarianism*

CURTIS W. REESE

Our Unitarian line of heritage is ancient and diverse, for we hail from many lands and from many faiths. In present-day Unitarianism is the urge of antiquity, as well as the pull of modernity. Its roots reach back into the soil of all the great religions, of many sects and heresies, and of man's earliest efforts to enhance and enrich his life by means of whatever power or powers that could be found within or about him.

When the modern Unitarian regards Unitarianism as a world movement rather than a mere sect of Christendom, he is not severing Unitarianism from its history, as is sometimes charged, but is recognizing its connection with its total and not merely its partial history. In our line of descent are the glories and the tragedies, the errors and the truths, the triumphs and the failures of religion through the ages.

The modern Unitarian in America is not content to think of his heritage only in terms of the Humanist-Theist controversy, the Western issue, the Baltimore Sermon, the English struggle against acts of oppression, the courageous careers of Francis David, Socinus and John Huss, nor in terms of heretical sects such as the Anabaptists, the Arians, the Monarchians and the Ebonites. All of these made important contributions. But of equal and perhaps greater influence in the making of modern Unitarianism are the movements of thought in Christian Modernism, in Reformed Judaism, in ethical religion, in the social awakening throughout the world, in the whole of modern science and psychology, sociology and anthropology, in the literature of emancipation, and in the careers of all the prophets of humanity—the Christs and the Buddhas wherever found and flying whatever flags. Modern scholarship and modern means of communication, plus open minds and eager hearts, make us really the heirs of all the ages, and place upon us a special charge to pass on to ages yet to come the spirit that is genuine, the mind that is flexible, and the will that sets men free.

It is in the light of such a background as this, such a spirit, and such a will that I say modern Unitarianism or its equivalent is the flowering of the religious spirit, and the hope of the spirit of man.

But when we turn from this radiant background to the immediate foreground we see disquieting shadows cast by clouds of doubt. True, through the clouds come rays of light but they are not sufficiently spread over the landscape.

Modern Unitarianism is a respectable minority, relatively free to practice and develop its faith without the interference of the civil disability suffered by the fathers. Our good works have made us favorably known, and our writings have mightily influenced the religious thinking of the world. And while individual Unitarians are generally imaginative, venturesome, and creative, corporately we are not abreast of our opportunities. We have no corporate policy of vigorous missionary endeavor; no corporate policy of ways and means to develop new parishes at new points or in new countries; no corporate policy in practical matters where small mishaps constantly multiplied lead to disaster. Far too long policies of general importance have been determined by chance and without sufficient thought and discussion.

After due allowance has been made for the good work that is being done by individual Unitarians, individual Unitarian churches, and our general organizations, it is still substantially correct to say that as a movement and in proportion to what we could do, we are marking time. Our numbers are relatively few; and while numbers is not the chief consideration, we should remember that we are talking about the number of persons involved and that persons are the chief consideration. With the pressing call of a distressed world ringing in our ears, we must not and cannot be satisfied to live on past glories, nor to burnish the busts in the Hall of Fame. Ours is an urgent call to great adventure and great triumphs now!

Unlike most religious movements, the Unitarian has no desire to build an organization for its own sake. Denominational consciousness, which is so evident among the members of other churches, is rarely found

*Address delivered October 27, 1948, before the Michigan Area Conference in session at Grosse Pointe, Michigan.

among Unitarians. Our churches frequently coöperate with others in establishing social institutions, all the while submerging their denominational interests in the movement and ultimately surrendering control to others whom they believe to be better equipped to perform the tasks involved.

So modest have Unitarians been in setting forth the claim of their church to a place in the sun, that some who have not given sufficient thought and serious consideration to the fundamental functions of the Unitarian church have arrived at the erroneous conclusion that Unitarianism has done its work and must give way to the liberal movement in orthodoxy. There is a liberal movement in orthodoxy for which Unitarians may well be glad. Many liberal orthodox churches are effectively proclaiming the Unitarian gospel. Indeed, some of the more liberal orthodox churches are more progressive than many conservative Unitarian churches. But on the basis of a fairly wide experience with various liberal movements, I feel safe in saying that on the whole the Unitarian church is more distinctive in gospel and function than is any other religious movement and more so today than the Unitarian church itself has ever been before. When liberal orthodoxy and the progressive movements in other religions are given full credit for their rich supply of spiritual goods, the distinctive features of modern Unitarianism still stand out in bold relief and challenge the world to come on to greater heights.

Not only do I believe this to be true, but it is also my opinion that such a faith, backed by an intelligent understanding of our place in the long distance program of religion, is essential to the successful maintenance and extension of our church.

I want to consider briefly (1) certain distinctive features of modern Unitarianism which make it uniquely important in the midst of the religious world; (2) some of the vital problems that confront present-day Unitarians; and (3) the need for a forward movement.

The Unitarian church is distinctive in its emphasis on and practice of intelligent and untrammeled thought and discussion in every field of human concern. One of our basic beliefs is that spiritual health is found only in intellectual freedom.

Necessarily, free discussion has certain natural limits —among them, common courtesy, consideration for the feelings of others, and due respect for the fitness of things. Free speech is not license for one to stand in the market-place and publicly cleanse one's mind. Nor is it license to expose indecently the souls of others. But free discussion does demand full and fair consideration of every phase of every subject.

With embarrassing exceptions the Unitarian church has stood consistently for free discussion, holding that free expression is as essential to free development as is free thought. And in these exceptions I dare say that it may be shown that the speakers themselves have been somewhat at fault. If a speaker observes the common courtesies, has respect for the feelings of others and due regard for the fitness of things, the Unitarian church will give him a fair hearing on any subject from self-sufficiency to the federation of the world, and from birth control to the transmigration of souls! Of this record we may be justly proud.

Calm and deliberate intellectual and factual toil in the interpretation of experience is the way to the discovery and understanding of life. Let no one fear the indictment often made that Unitarians are too intellectually inquisitive. Let us rather fear that we shall fail to be convicted. Others who have gone before have set a high standard in this respect—chief among them William Ellery Channing, the father of American Unitarianism. It will be an ill day for our church when we lower the standard, even though the temptation to do so be ever so great. If the future belongs to us, it does so in virtue of the progress of the human mind. And if we are to come into our heritage we are to do so, not in virtue of descending to unworthy methods but in virtue of maintaining that high intellectual standard so nobly set by those whose names we honor.

And the maintenance of this standard is tied up with free discussion. Minds do not grow under undue restrictions. If dogmas—theological or political, industrial or social—fetter our minds, growth is unlikely. We must see to it that the free interplay of free minds shall forever remain a cardinal doctrine of our faith. And whenever there arise among us those who would interfere with the intellectual and spiritual liberty of their brethren such persons should be called to account with characteristic gentleness but also with dispatch!

As with no other religious group, and from earliest times till now, the Unitarian is distinctive as the church of the human emphasis.

Back in my theological schooldays there was considerable discussion as to whether the church should be theocentric or Christocentric. The weight of the argument seemed to be on the side of a Christocentric church. The shifting of the central interest of religion to Christ Jesus was a distinct gain, since Christ Jesus —even as interpreted by the church—was more intimately related to man than the God of the church could ever be.

Since the typical Unitarian procedure has always been to move from the consideration of man to whatever attitude we may hold toward things cosmic, Unitarian soil was ready for the growth of Humanism in religion, which in my opinion is the most hopeful change in emphasis that has taken place since Jesus said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

From the very first, Unitarians preached the divinity of man. But whether we believe in man as good or bad, or in truth some of both, we begin with man and proceed from man to whatever world view may seem most hopeful and satisfying to the individual Unitarian. It can be stated confidently on no less authority than that of Ephraim Emerton, that the Unitarian's "religious thinking begins with and centers about the idea of man himself as an independent, self-determining being. His religion is a religion of humanity, starting from human impulses, limited by human capacities, working by human methods, and expressing itself in human ways." To this classic utterance I merely add: To understand that to minister to man is worship in its noblest sense is the beginning of spiritual wisdom.

The concept of unity is basic to Unitarianism and would seem to be a fundamental acceptable to all faiths; but unfortunately it is thoroughly understood and practised by none, although the place given to it in Unitarian theory and practice is exceptionally prominent.

While man's nature is manifestly very complex, to the Unitarian man appears as essentially a unity. There are phases of man called body, mind, and spirit, and the Unitarian admits that facts as well as the poverty of language require the use of these terms; but he sees

them as phases which go to make up a splendid unity, and does not regard them as everlastingly antagonistic.

The Unitarian proclaimed the harmony of those aspects of man's nature called body, mind, and spirit, long before modern science proclaimed the acute interdependence of mind and body. So the Unitarian was not upset in his religion when he heard that physical conditions are partly subject to mental control and that certain "mental processes, emotions, and passions may be reduced to physical terms, tested and measured by physical devices."

To the Unitarian there is no necessary and permanent dualism in man's nature, but a community of being—a splendid unity. He sees the body as a glorious part of man, and not something to be ashamed of because it is not the mind; he sees the mind not in the least degraded because it is integral to the body.

The Unitarian carries this doctrine of unity over into his wider relationships and strives to build social unity by integrating the diverse elements of our complex world life. From the unity of man he moves to the unity of mankind. He sees no distinction in nature or in the possibility of ethical and spiritual development between the so-called highest and the so-called lowest peoples on earth.

When we consider the transcendent importance of free inquiry, of a gospel centered on man, and of a unitary philosophy of life, and when we realize how few people know that we exist and that most of these do not understand our great affirmations but believe that we are a group based on mutual abhorrence of hell, we see how necessary it is to have clear-cut convictions on these matters and how needful it is that they be proclaimed with conviction. It is high time that we move forward with "zeal according to knowledge."

In this large task of extending the Unitarian movement, we need to face realistically the problems that confront us.

There is, first of all, the pressing problem of our individual relation to the church. Not regarding the church as an end, we are inclined to neglect it as a means. Forgetful that the church is a composite life, we have held the church responsible for failure for which we ourselves were responsible. As individuals we will be loyal to the church only when we believe it to be worth our loyalty; but in spite of the immense emotional and spiritual inheritance of the church, its worthfulness today depends largely on what we put into it. By identifying the church with great causes we can make it worth our loyalty.

But our loyalty is too often of the drifting type when it should be of the directive type. Loyalty to the church should take the form of conscious directive control, not that of submission and trust. We do not belong to the church: the church belongs to us. Thus regarded, the church may become the living embodiment of great causes.

Of importance no less than that of the relation of the individual to the local church is that of the local churches to each other and to the general organizations of the church.

That we need some reorganization of our forces is the generally accepted view of most, if not quite all, of our active leaders today; and with most of these, so far as my information goes, there is no question about what kind of organization is needed. All seem aware that we need simply to put into effective operation the congregational polity that we have advocated for one hundred years. The congregational polity combines democratic control with the efficiency that inheres in centralization. This is the successful polity of several strong denominations, among them the Congregationalists, the Baptists, and the Disciples of Christ. The problem seems to be how to put this polity into operation, which is especially difficult in view of our many independent organizations, and is further complicated by legal matters growing out of property, endowments, etc. But, in my opinion, the solution lies primarily in the willingness to find it. If we sincerely desire a forward movement and are willing to forego technical rights in order that duties may be unhindered, the legal and other difficulties involved will amount to little or nothing.

In congregational polity sovereignty inheres in local churches. In their local operations these churches are examples of "direct democracy," and any organization that authoritatively represents these churches derives its authority from them. Since "direct democracy" is impossible of operation where many scattered churches are involved, the representative type of democracy is the accepted congregational method. There may be few or many associations, or conferences, but all such derive their powers from the local churches. Ordinarily the general organizations—state, district, national, or what not—function cooperatively and within certain limits defined by agreement; the main directive body being the organization that is most inclusive and therefore most likely to see things whole.

Naturally and properly, there should be district organizations—delegate bodies—with their proper officers; and by every principle of democracy, of congregational polity, and of demonstrated methods of efficiency, heads of the various departments of the general organization should function in connection with and largely through the district organization. Thus combining general policy with particular interests, we would increase results beyond anything we have known or dared to hope.

We now need to accept the fact that the congregational polity is as native to our movement as are our spiritual goods, and proceed to function accordingly.

Of supreme importance is the problem of the relation of our church both local and general to other social structures and movements.

The church in general is itself now regarded by many social scientists as a most pressing social problem. Is the church an instrument or a hindrance to just social arrangements? Does it exist to build personality and to socialize men? Do its results justify its expenditures? Is it a fossil in the stratum of yesterday, or a living force in the world of today?

Social statisticians and engineers are investigating and checking up on the work of the church. They want to know the ratio between its efforts and its achievements. These and other similar inquiries regarding the church in general are pressing for answer. We may deny many of the conclusions of the investigators but we cannot deny the relevancy of their inquiry nor its effect on the thought of the people.

Regarding our own church, let us frankly admit that we have yet to catch up with some other social and moral and spiritual agencies; that we have yet to equip ourselves for effective work in a world of hard facts; that we have yet to forge our way into the foremost position of social and moral and spiritual leadership,

where we rightfully belong.

True, the church is interested primarily in impulses, values, ideals. But these are precisely the things that determine the direction of social movements and the quality of social institutions. In my opinion the world can never get along without an institution whose first business is to deal with things of first importance, namely, impulses, values, ideals. The name of such an institution and its official pronouncements are of secondary importance. The thing that will count is the fact that an institution committed to the task of dealing in basic human worths actually handles the goods in question and puts them on the markets of the world.

The function of the church in its relation to other social structures and movements is to call the world to the constant re-examination of its basic motives and ideals, and to the moral necessity of building into the life of the world the best motives and ideals known to man.

Our Unitarian gospel puts us in tune with the democratic spirit of the age, and our unique theoretical position gives us an advantage that we should make the most of. We should no longer be content to appeal only to the few who cannot find satisfaction in the old creeds, or to be merely a refuge for theological outcasts.

We must grasp the fact that there is no incongruity so far as helpful association is concerned between quality and quantity. We have long gloried in our quality, and rightly so, but have failed to grasp the fact that quality justifies itself in serving quantity.

With the exception of a few communities it is still true in America that the Unitarian is approached with askance. Not even Unitarian Boston is wholly leavened. Chicago, notwithstanding its great liberal University and despite its profusion of heretics, is medievally and fanatically orthodox. And the great Southland has hardly been touched. There are tens of thousands in America who have hardly heard the name Unitarian, except possibly in connection with men in the Hall of Fame, or from the lips of some Billy Sunday.

Possessing a beautiful and helpful message, we have been content personally to enjoy and be benefited by that message—leaving the vast multitudes alone.

The uniqueness of our faith—our freedom, our humanism, and our unitary philosophy of life—should create in us the broadest and deepest interest in persons,—an interest that would face courageously any problem and triumphantly banish any difficulty. I crave for our movement a sympathetic understanding of the fundamental worth of all persons and a generous attitude toward persons in all their relationships. To this end we need to know people; to know their hopes and disappointments, their high aims and bitter failures, their lonely dreams and social inadequacy. It is on a basis of experience with people that our hearts mellow and our spirits grow generous.

Never yet has there been a great religious movement without a deep experience of human needs, and great action in the service of human needs. The church with a future will be the church that takes most seriously the immemorial religious attitudes of love to man and of the service of mankind, and makes these effective in the life of the world by the intelligent use of modern knowledge and techniques.

Let us revise upward our understanding of the nature and significance of our movement, and come to think of it in terms of a potential Church Universal.

Free Fellowships and Communism

EDITH HANSEN

This fall, for the first time, I became involved in uncertainties pertaining to the relationships of democratic organizations to Communists and Communism. I am co-chairman of human relations for a county board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. For several years before this fall, I had easily arranged for cooperation between the board and various metropolitan, county, state, and national organizations for aiding advancement of democratic rights. Now, however, I am balked by conflicts of policy among organizations, differences of opinion within my board, and my limited ability to think my way through the tangle. In the course of my conferences and correspondence, the open membership policy of the WILPF was challenged. I stubbornly defended the policy, but with a consciousness that my defense was poor. This consciousness has stimulated my mind to intensive thinking, not only about the WILPF, but also about other fellowships which emphasize freedom of thought. I am still very much in a forest on a dark night. But one of the organization leaders has helped me find what I believe is a road to somewhat of understanding. I have been helped to get started on the realization that the policy of a group in regard to Communism and Communists should depend upon the purpose of the group, its own experience, and the experience of groups of similar purpose. Not all organizations can use the same tests for determining the value of a member.

Exclusion of Communists would alter fundamentally the character of the WILPF. Few Communists have ever cared to become members, and most of them have not continued. But the psychological effect of shutting out those few would be disastrous. In our county board of seventeen women, there are members of four political parties—Democratic, Progressive, Republican, Socialist. Economic viewpoints range from faith in capitalism, not too much changed from our present system, to industrial democracy as close to Communism as would be possible without totalitarianism. In between these views, we favor various forms of mixed economy, with our interest growing in cooperatives and in socialization of basic industries under democratic regional controls representing government, labor, and public. Ethnically, we reflect American heterogeneity. As regards war, most of us are pacifists; a few are not. In religious organization representation, we have Protestant Christians, Friends, a Christian Scientist, a member of Hadassah, a Humanist who belongs to an Ethical Society, and several members without affiliation. We are all religious in nature, and the devotion which we share in WILPF fellowship is to the ideals of peace and freedom as goals for mankind and as a present way of life for ourselves and others. When discussions become exciting and tempers rise,

our common faith calls forth within us self-control, respect for others, and, consequently, an increase of faith in peace and freedom as a way to learn as individuals and to accomplish some things as a group. To exclude Communists would be a denial of this faith. It would be a denial of faith in the inherent power of right ideas and in the value of human association and persuasion. In free fellowships, absolutely necessary discipline should be conducted upon an individual basis, with behavior, not belief, the criterion of judgment.

Exclusion of Communists from my WILPF board would alienate a minority of members who have a special interest in Communism and a particular sympathy with Communists. To call these women fellow travelers is a false judgment. An alleged characteristic of Communists and persons who collaborate is the forming of cliques for gaining management control of organizations useful for purposes of the Communist Party. These women are thoroughly democratic in behavior. Confusion is a common present ailment among liberals. The confusions of the majority of members of the free fellowships are not very apparent, because they are similar to the confusions of most Americans. Those who are sympathetically interested in Communism, however, are exposed in the glare of public disapproval. It is my urgent conviction that the free fellowships will meet a real test of their value in their treatment of these courageous members who refuse to be rushed in their thinking about Communism.

Aggressive efforts to cleanse the WILPF and other free fellowships of Communism would make them authoritarian. Democratic idealism is dynamic. Its truth is never static. It is not easily analyzed. It is a morning star of many rays, an ascending highway with many side roads and difficult little trails. Who are we to make rigid pronouncements regarding it? During the last war our anti-Fascist zeal clouded some of our thinking. There was too little emphasis upon our unique mission of believing in the power of right ideas to leaven wrong ideas and in the capacity of people to achieve democratic attitudes under favorable circumstances. It is our special responsibility to understand subtle democratic values and insidious dangers of categorical theorizing about democracy. Countless numbers of yearning and aspiring human spirits, through all the ages of the past, favorable geographic and economic circumstances in our America, our heritage of social opportunities, the three-century development of the American democratic faith nourished by science, philosophy, and religion,—all these and other factors, social and personal, have given us magnificent opportunity, favorable conditions, for developing our faiths. Circumstances now are becoming less favorable. The wind of public disapproval has changed direction. Shall we blow along with the wind? Or shall we face it and hold fast for the younger people faiths which it will be more difficult for them to feel? John W. Cyrus, in the July-August issue of UNITY, wrote with great insight of our tendency to become, ourselves, a threat to free thinking.

> This is no time [he challenged us] to draw up exclusion laws for a liberal religious movement. . . . We have far, far to go with mind and heart. The open, responsive mind and heart know no resting place in a world that moves and changes daily because dynamic forces move it: dynamic fears, dynamic hopes, dynamic savagery and ferocity, and dynamic loves.

We must maintain our open memberships as our most effective aid to preserving and advancing civil liberties and other freedoms in American democracy and world democracy. My husband, who was born and lived his early years on one of the Frisian islands, told me an old story that had been handed down by generations of Frisians from a thousand years ago. It was the period when Christianity was overcoming loyalties to the old gods. An old man who was a leader of the people counseled the younger loyalists that if the new movement should prove to be of value, it would remain and grow in spite of their resistance. If it were not of value, it would pass. "That was an expression of calm in social integration lacking in these times," commented my husband. There must be aggressive efforts in behalf of civil liberties, democratic rights for ethnic groups denied them, democratic economies, political reforms, and other freedoms. Members of free fellowships should be active in them. But as fellowships, we can make our best contribution in giving calm expression, by open membership, to our faith that democracy can hold its own and win its way through its inherent worth.

We must maintain our open memberships in order to strengthen our distinctive faiths, hold our radical members, keep our fellowships free, and aid the preservation and development of the freedoms of democracy in the United States and in the world. We need open memberships for a fifth reason: to help in the cultivation of the spirit of cooperation. People of radically different viewpoints must learn to find areas of agreement. We must learn to want to compromise and to cooperate in all ways that will benefit mankind and strengthen the possibilities of peace. We need practice in drawing clear-cut distinctions between values which should not be sacrificed, and ideas, ambitions, and plans which are less important than compromise and cooperation. Neither the American people nor any portion of the American people have as yet done all that can be done to find, advocate, and support cooperative endeavors among the world's people. Exclusion of Communists would be an initial obstruction in new creative efforts by free fellowships. This fifth reason for open membership is closely related to the other four. They are needed to make it sound. And it gives universal and eternal significance to them.

Organizations about which I have made inquiries may be divided into several groups. *First group:* I firmly believe that essentially religious fellowships valuing freedom of thought should not bar Communists.

Second group: Organizations having specialized programs in behalf of civil liberties and other democratic rights, and seeking wide public support, need to bar Communists for one or more reasons. Communists are not psychologically fitted for serving on their staffs. General public support and the particular support of organized labor cannot be won if Communists are included. The central staffs of such organizations, being responsible for the effective use of money and confidence invested by many people in specific efforts, must be able to give entire attention to preparing and conducting their programs. The staff members should not be distracted by the necessity of combatting Communist drives for management control. Programs for civil liberties and other democratic rights are so vitally important that they should move forward without Communist obstruction.

Third group: Toward certain organizations having general or specialized democratic purposes, open to all interested persons, and having serious problems re-

garding Communist members, I purpose to keep an openminded willingness to learn facts helpful to true understanding. Some of these organizations may gain and contribute much good by adventure, experimentation, and struggle in an open membership policy.

Fourth group: Organizations devoted particularly to the championing of civil liberties or democratic rights in general for radical or persecuted people should be judged by their group actions. There are Communists in the leadership of some of them. Support is sought primarily from liberals. If they wish the support of many liberals, they will make their official programs strictly in accord with civil rights principles. The tendency is for them to do this.

In each of these groups there is dire need for understanding of the purposes and problems of other organizations. Many of the leaders are too busy to study the issues comprehensively. Some individuals should take the time to do so. As one such person, I am eager to have all the help possible. I invite information, suggestions, opinions, questions, and criticism, no matter how adverse. The variety of current attitudes held by democratically minded people is illustrated by expressions made to me recently by five highly intelligent community leaders.

"Why should people who do not believe in democracy have the benefits of democracy?"

"I came near joining the Communist Party. There are splendid people in it. But when I learned by experience of their knock-down-and-drag-out methods, I wanted nothing more to do with Communists."

"I believe that Communists should not be barred from an organization. But one must be constantly on the alert in trying to work with them. They will try to direct every action for the advantage of the Communist Party. My conclusion is based on a good deal of personal experience."

"In ———— the liberals went to bat with the same fervor as the Communists and won out! I still think we must try to cooperate with them. If we cannot cooperate with them here with a small number of Communists and try to use the method of reconciliation, how can we hope to use conciliation with a whole nation of them?"

"In ———— there are enough Communists to dominate if they would. But they are doing the opposite. They are sacrificing the goals of the Communist Party for the good of the organization. My estimate of Communists has risen."

Examination of the philosophy of Communism is helpful to working out a point of view regarding the relationships of organizations to it. There are phases of democratic idealism and democratic procedure in Communism which I admire. But dictatorship, totalitarianism, and force are inherent. Certain democratic rights are emphasized and encouraged, but civil rights for all people are not within the scope of Communism. Section 9, Article IV, of the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States of America obligates members "to fight with all their strength against any and every effort, whether it comes from abroad or from within our country, to destroy the rights of labor and the people, or to impose upon the United States the arbitrary will of any group or party or clique or conspiracy, thereby violating the unqualified right of the majority of the people to direct the destinies of our country." This would seem to some people to be democratic. But in a genuinely democratic political and economic system, there must be provision for minorities—political, economic, religious, ethnic, educational, occupational, etc.—to help influence the destinies of a nation and of the world. It would never be possible for all the people in any portion of the world to think alike politically and economically. Minorities and individuals should have freedom to try to influence government and public opinion. Both the economic system and the political system should be elastic enough to allow for changes in public sentiment. When there is no allowance within a system for opposition, dictatorship and force become inevitable. Civil liberties are impossible. "The Communist Party upholds the achievements of American democracy and defends the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights"—but only "against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and popular liberties." The "ultimate aim" of the party is "the establishment of Socialism by the free choice of the majority of the American people." The Communist Party educates the working class for its historic mission: the establishment of Socialism. The working class will lead the government of the people. The assumption is that the majority will always prefer this government. "All the capitalist parties — Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated," states William Z. Foster in *Toward Soviet America,* "the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses." All genuine liberties are within Communism, as well as the full realization of life, happiness, and the benefits of labor, science, and culture for all men and women. Expressions of opinion outside the system are inimical to democracy.

So far as explanations contained within the party constitution are concerned, one might conclude that there is a great deal of opportunity for cooperation between Communists and liberals—while the Communist Party is a minority. Members are forbidden to participate in the activities of any group which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken, or overthrow any institutions of American democracy through which the majority of the American people can maintain their right to determine their destinies. Whether this means that a group of Communists *should not* capture a state FEPC committee, or that, being representatives of the future majority, they *should* capture it, I have not yet inquired of party headquarters. My inquiries have led me to conclude that there are members of the party who do not form such cliques. But in contrast to reports about these members, there are such a variety and number of testimonies about Communist efforts for control of organizations that I must accept the clique technique tentatively as characteristic.

The inherent totalitarianism of Communism and practical expressions of it must be opposed by methods expressive of basic civil liberties principles. Else liberals do as much harm as Communists, and probably more.

> The heightened fears of Communist activity, in the face of the comparative weakness of the Party's influence, [states the annual report of the American Civil Liberties Union, *Our Uncertain Liberties*] are obviously to be attributed to the international conflict with the Soviet Union and the expansion of Communism abroad. Their disturbing aspect for defenders of civil liberty is the growth of the feeling that something must be done to suppress what is so much feared, even if it means surrender of freedom "for the thought that we hate"—and with it, we may add, other thoughts as well.

When nearing the close of this article, I received from a Leader of the American Ethical Union a statement concerning the membership policy of the Ethical

Societies. I had written to New York explaining that I was writing this article and asking for a statement. In my letter I wrote briefly of my viewpoint.

> The Ethical Movement has never taken an official position on this question [states the letter from New York] but in general this could be said to be the approach to the problem, as many of us see it. The first test of membership is whether the person is in sympathy with the philosophy and program of the Societies in a consecration to the sacredness of human personality, the supreme importance of human relationships, and the making of a more ethical world. From the viewpoint of the Ethical Societies, a faith in man implies faith in the democratic concept of society and in democratic methods—the reconciliation of men to one another, whatever their differences may be. No one who subscribes to ethical religion and democratic faith should be barred from membership in the Ethical Societies because of his political opinions. However, in so far as extremists on both the Right and the Left may want to affiliate, the process of induction into the Society should include a careful screening, to be sure that they know what the Society stands for and that they are people whose beliefs and motives are consistent with ethical principles.

I feel shaken in my foundation, and unsure whether I should assume to write on the subject of this article. I owe an unpayable debt to Mr. W. Edwin Collier, Leader of the Philadelphia Ethical Society, to the Society, to the AEU and a number of its Leaders. I do not mean to be presumptuous. I ask for help to understand, and if I can experience a change of view, I shall be willing to acknowledge it. My interest in the Ethical Movement was aroused first by an article in the *Standard* entitled "The Extreme Left Wing of Religion," the Ethical Movement being that wing. In joining the Philadelphia Ethical Society, I pledged devotion to "the ever-increasing knowledge, love, and practice of the right." It has been since joining, that ethical principles have become increasingly meaningful to me. I have supposed that harmony between belief and ethical principles was an ideal and a goal rather than a prerequisite in the Ethical Societies. I have supposed that devotion to the right was the requirement, that the right was made up of growing concepts, and that the applicant's sincerity in his expression of devotion was assumed. I have supposed that I could continue in the Ethical fellowship so long as my behavior did not obstruct the purposes and work of the Society, and that through its influence I could improve my beliefs and motives. If a few Communists, Catholics, or other theoretical totalitarians can, with apparent sincerity, sign the AEU pledge of devotion to "the ever-increasing knowledge, love, and practice of the right," why should they be screened? The American Civil Liberties Union gives concentrated technical attention to clearly defined areas of democracy which are outside of Communism. I can understand why supporters of totalitarianism should not be permitted to serve on its staffs. But is the AEU a guardian of a limited, clear-cut area of "the right"? Or is its opportunity larger, more comprehensive, more universal? Need opposition to the totalitarianism inherent in Communism or in the Catholic hierarchy be one whit lessened if some extremists should become members? What will be the effect of a screening policy upon the membership of the Societies? Will it encourage open-minded search for new truth? Or will it encourage a tendency to demonstrate ethical orthodoxy? Will the AEU become authoritarian as to what democracy and ethical principles are? Can the AEU encourage faith in "the reconciliation of men to one another, whatever their differences may be," if no token representatives of those people with whom we most need to be reconciled may participate? I have a Catholic neighbor who believes in the authority of the Catholic Church, but whose relationships with neighbors and community are democratic. I have a relative in Germany who was a Nazi during the war, but who is spontaneously democratic in her behavior. There are some leaders of the free fellowships who know theories of democracy, but whose behavior is not democratic. Can the Ethical Societies help people to understand these disharmonies and to achieve harmony by using a screening policy? Some members of the WILPF believe that we should keep strictly separate from Communists and also that we should not give too much encouragement to radicals right of Communism. Dr. Cyrus wrote of protectors within Unitarianism of religion and the American way of life. Who will withstand the drift toward ideological isolationism, if not the free fellowships? The Communists hold that democracy is for those who believe in it. Is this to be the philosophy of the free fellowships? Or can we have faith in a democracy great enough to include, in course of time, all mankind?

In commenting upon the expulsion of John Gates, Communist and editor of the *Daily Worker,* from the American Veterans Committee, an editorial in the *AVC Bulletin* for September makes this comment: "The thinking on both sides of the vote reflected all the same basic considerations of democracy. The choice lay in the method of protecting democratic processes." "I would not like to see AVC, at this time," declared Bernard Bellush, dissenting member of the National Planning Committee, "offer one particle of aid, unintentional as it may seem to most of us, to the creation of a totalitarian climate, as President Truman worded it." Every responsible organization in the United States can contribute to the preservation and development of democracy.

"In the present crisis in the Western World, with democracy struggling for its life and even respect of man for man being seriously undermined, our salvation depends in the long run on our being able to see that there are reasonable and unreasonable ways of determining ends, and that we are not deceived when we commit ourselves to the values of equality, freedom, and community as against their alternatives." This quotation is from Dr. Edwin Arthur Burtt's book, *Right Thinking.* While awaiting replies to this article, I shall be studying Dr. Burtt's book and so prepare my spirit for a right reception of new insights.

Smoke

It is peace in the evening.
Across the screen of the high trees
The weed-fire smoke as blue as love-in-the-mist
Loiters or goes as the winds please.

Softly now, without pain or sting
The heart can afford to play
With memories of its travailing,
Follies and cares of the long day——
Beautiful wraiths which loiter and cling
A moment in boughs of its enduring peace
Then vanish like smoke away.

Yes, but the fuel now heightening
This charm that lingers on
Was born of many a passionate hour in flower
Now dead. And the day is gone.

GEOFFREY JOHNSON.

Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman

LEONARD B. GRAY

Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman was a magnificent human being. Indeed, in him our humanity rose to a height such as it seldom does. He combined the erudition of a great scholar, the vision of a great prophet, the passion for social righteousness of a great humanitarian, and the zeal of a great crusader. When I heard him in Kings' Chapel, Boston, I marvelled with the others in the large congregation and with the thousands who heard him on various occasions at his learning, insight, passion, and eloquence. Those who knew him personally claim that his great heart was equal to his great intellect, and that he had a genius for friendship and a rare power to make people love him. No man since Phillips Brooks so strongly won the heart of Boston as did this gifted and beloved rabbi who was taken from us at the early age of forty-one. The heart of the great city was literally broken by Liebman's sudden passing. Citizens of all races, classes, and religions were stunned and grief-stricken. Legislature sessions were interrupted to express grief and to pay tribute to this great citizen and religious leader. People of all faiths attended his funeral. Public schools were closed in his honor during his funeral. Great business concerns put words of mourning in place of their regular advertisements in the newspapers. Catholics and Protestants joined Jews to speak words of sincere grief and high praise over the radio. Protestant churches held memorial services. The Very Reverend Edwin Jan Van Etten, dean of Saint Paul's Cathedral, in announcing the memorial service in his church for this extraordinary rabbi, said, "He was one of the great, outstanding religious leaders of the world."

Liebman's great Temple Israel and Boston, which the young rabbi loved so much that larger Temples elsewhere could not induce him to leave, mourned his passing the most, and yet throughout America and in various parts of the world countless people felt that religion and humanity had suffered a heavy loss. It was generally believed that both Judaism and Christendom were losing one of the keenest religious thinkers and one of the greatest exponents of the divine worth of man and of a mature, liberal religion of our day. Indeed, not a few people recognized that mankind had lost a religious thinker of insight and power such as occurs only once or twice in a century. Many who had read those compassionate words in his widely-read book, *Peace of Mind,* which could "never minimize the sadness of young melodies cut off in the first stanza" sadly felt that the future would be denied a great spiritual enrichment because of the unsung melodies they had expected from this gifted young prophet.

Dr. Liebman, a descendant of a long line of rabbis, was born April 7, 1907, at Hamilton, Ohio. At the early age of fifteen the brilliant student graduated from high school. He studied for the rabbinate at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati before he entered the University of Cincinnati. After he was ordained in the reformed rabbinate at the age of twenty-three, he continued his studies at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, where he won the degree of doctor of Hebrew Literature. As rabbi, he served in Lafayette, Indiana, for a short time, and then at a Chicago Temple from which he was called to Boston in 1939. In his nine years at Temple Israel his congregation more than doubled. In addition to his rabbinical duties he held professorships at the University of Chicago, Boston University, Harvard, and Andover-Newton Theological School, and preached and lectured at many colleges and universities where he attracted great crowds of students. He was like Harry Emerson Fosdick in his humanness, breadth of reading, and understanding, keen insight into contemporary modes of thinking and life-situations, maturity of outlook, adventurous and challenging religion, and unique and eloquent power of expression that made an especially strong appeal to young America.

Though we are denied the many unsung melodies whereby the young rabbi could have enriched our lives had he lived, we are deeply thankful for the many he did sing during his short life. To those who knew him intimately, he gave the influence of his buoyant and delightful personality, of his rare power to imitate and mimic many of the leading lecture personalities of the country, of his compassion and understanding, and of his conversation filled with wit and humor and abundant knowledge of history and literature. In his great Temple Israel, from many pulpits and platforms, and from radio broadcasting stations he gave thousands of listeners a wealth of knowledge and wisdom drawn from the best minds of the ages, and a tremendous impetus to victorious daily living. His book, *Peace of Mind,* helped millions of people to understand themselves and their personal problems, to master bereavement and sorrow and fear, to adjust themselves to the perplexities of our disturbed day, and to find serenity and peace of mind. He inspired people to believe in themselves, in their divine worth, in their ability to help their fellow men. He extended before many the far-flung horizons of hope and belief that if they could release the immeasurable flood of goodness that was in man they could transform this universe and get glimpses of Utopia in their own day. He reconciled the eternal realities in religion to the scientific knowledge of man and of the universe and showed how these realities are applicable to and usable in the life-situations of men in our contemporary world. He taught men to respect their fellow men by first of all respecting themselves. He showed how religion and psychiatry could join friendly hands in building a new self in a person. He was a great force for enlightenment and maturity of mind. Indeed, maturity was a frequent word in his writings and sermons and addresses, and I personally feel that during the last few years he was the greatest exponent of a mature religion in our country. Not only by his magazine articles and speeches, many of which were based on both his idealism and scientific study of racism and bigotry, but also by his personal friendships with people of various races and classes and faiths he did much to remove the complexities and obstacles that divide men. Not only by preaching theories and ideals and principles, but also by actual fighting for definite and practical ways of making them effective, such as a State Employment Practices Commission, did he enter many crusades for social improvement. Not only was he one of Judaism's greatest opponents of anti-Semitism, but he was also and chiefly one of America's greatest promoters of our democratic way of life and of universal human rights. Not content with general ideas and dog-

matic abstractions, Liebman made religion apply to something in particular. With all-out and ceaseless devotion he translated divine ideals into earthly realities. Indeed, "the little rabbi," as he was affectionately called, was a master in teaching men how to make their faith go to work on the handicaps and frustrations and fears of living.

Rabbi Liebman was interested in mankind, in people, in groups, in human causes and movements, but he was much more interested in individual persons. In his busy life, he took time and pains to make, to cultivate, and to keep close personal friendships. He made himself freely accessible to individuals who sought interviews with him about their personal problems. He understood humanity through individuals, not individuals through humanity. He observed, admired, and liked particular actions and qualities in persons. One day he learned that a New York taxicab driver on a hectic ride through heavy traffic had said to his two nervous passengers, "You two guys ought to read *Peace of Mind*." Then he told them that he himself had read the book, had given six copies of it to his friends, and had driven the author in his cab. The "little rabbi" in Boston was deeply touched. He went immediately to his study and wrote a long letter of appreciation to his taxicab reader in New York.

Joshua Loth Liebman will continue to live deeply in our admirations and affections. For years mankind will be greatly indebted to him for his inestimable contributions to mental health, applied religion, and dynamic living. He often urged us to establish new beachheads for a greater religion and a greater humanity. We would be grateful for the beachheads that he himself established, and march on and up from them.

The Study Table

Experience-Centered Education

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION? By *Raymond B. Johnson. Boston: Beacon Press. 88 pp. $1.50.*

In this brief study, the Unitarian minister at Hingham, Massachusetts, has given us a useful tool for parent education. His approach to religious education is that of modern education and he advocates an experience-centered program. There is nothing particularly new or startling in this. His major contribution is the way in which he deals with the perennial question of parents about the use of the Bible in Church Schools. He points out the contradictions in the minds of parents who want modern educational techniques and yet feel that the values and absolutes of the Bible and Christianity must be included. He suggests that parents who do not know the Bible themselves, do not read it themselves, and give no indication of its importance to their children at home, should analyze their own feelings and thoughts in this regard. Mr. Johnson stresses the family as religious educator and points up the responsibility of parents.

This book is valuable to any who are leading parents' groups or working with religious education committees. It should be read by anyone who believes that the Bible is a suitable book for children or that the omission of its teachings in the early years will handicap the religious development of the child. Based on the psychology of learning as well as a liberal approach to religion, this brief study should be useful to every Church School group.

GLADYS R. HILTON.

A Guide to the Apocrypha

THE APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE. *By Charles Cutler Torrey. New Haven: Yale University Press. 151 pp. $3.00.*

The last few years have seen a revival of interest in the great body of literature lying outside the canon of the Old and New Testaments. Colleges and universities have added to their curricula courses in world literature. The Apocrypha is an important part of world literature. Readers of world literature will at once recall the stories of Tobit, Judith, the heroic struggles of the Maccabees, and the Legends of the patriarchs and prophets. These same readers often feel the need of a handbook to this literature explaining references

(Continued on page 94)

The Field

(Continued from page 78)

6. For most patients there is insufficient medical service.

7. There are only 4500 psychiatrists in the United States.

8. Ten thousand new psychiatrists are needed.

9. Psychiatric social workers, psychologists, and nurses are similarly in short supply.

10. Psychiatric education in medical schools is in need of drastic improvement.

11. The American Psychiatric Association recommends $5.00 a day for acute cases and $2.50 a day for continued treatment cases in order to provide adequate service in mental hospitals. No state has met this standard.

III. There Is Hope Ahead

1. Scientific treatment results in the discharge as recovered of 17 per cent of the patients in mental hospitals, and 29 per cent are discharged as improved even with the present insufficient staff and other facilities.

2. Newer methods of treatment are even more promising.

3. There is little evidence that mental disease is increasing. As our clinics and hospitals increase the existence of cases becomes more evident.

4. One-half the patients in mental hospitals are due to one form of mental disease—dementia praecox, on the treatment of which definite progress is being made.

—*Joint Bulletin of The National Mental Health Foundation, and The National Committee for Mental Hygiene.*

found in great writers. Professor Torrey's book fulfills this need. It also gives a brief history of this literature in the Church.

It is a great pity that all Bibles do not contain the Apocrypha. There is no law to forbid its use. The Protestant churches usually consider the Apocrypha important for history but not for doctrine. The Church of Rome uses these books also for doctrine. The curricula of most Church Schools now give place to some use of the Apocrypha. For all these uses this book is admirably written by the world's foremost authority in this field.

C. A. Hawley.

Lord Acton Speaks

Esssays on Freedom and Power. *By Lord Acton. Selected and with an Introduction by Gertrude Himmelfarb. Boston: Beacon Press. 428 pp. $5.00.*

John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, the first Baron Acton, was a liberal Catholic or a Catholic Liberal. In reading these essays one is never quite certain which will prove to be the dominating undercurrent, the liberal principles of freedom or the institutionalized power of the Catholic Church. The total impression is rather confusing, although he does bring into focus the major conflicts that arise between the expression of freedom and the exercise of power. His analysis of the historical, political, ideological patterns involved in the processes of expanding freedom and limiting power on the continent, in England, and in America, serves to sharpen one's thinking in these matters today.

His writings, coming as they did in the latter half of the nineteenth century, have the advantage of voluminous materials dealing with those exciting and critical years of the American and French revolutions plus the rise and fall of Napoleon. He does not fail to tackle the problem created by the Vatican Council in 1870 and the struggle for power within the Catholic Church. His attitude on this and other church matters came close to bringing excommunication.

When the internal conflict broke out in the United States (1861), Acton was distressed at the dissolution of this great experiment. However, he felt that it was the logical result of the inconsistencies inherent in the American constitution. His sympathies were with the argument of Hayne and Calhoun, which he felt to be sound. He presents at some length in his essay "The Political Causes of the American Revolution (1861—)" the political, economic, and ideological conflicts that had to be resolved in setting up the American form of government, and gives copious citations from the works of Hamilton, Jefferson, and other founders of the Republic.

Not the least of the contribution of this book is the life of Lord Acton presented as an introduction by the compiler. So far as this reviewer knows it is the most complete biography of Acton in existence. It would be of value for those who quote Lord Acton's famous dictum, often ignorantly, that "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely," to know more about this man. If they read these essays they can find other quotations, for he excels in making phrases which can be used in the support of freedom and power.

Randall S. Hilton.

Books Received

Arctic Sheba. *By A. D. Blythe. Kansas City, Mo.: Burton Publishing Co. 251 pp. $2.50.*

Art And Religion. *By Von Ogden Vogt. Boston: The Beacon Press. 280 pp. $4.50.*

Channing Day By Day. *Compiled and edited by José Chapiro. Boston: The Beacon Press. 446 pp. $5.00.*

Christian Science and Philosophy. *By Henry W. Steiger. New York: Philosophical Library. 234 pp. $3.75.*

Gandhi's Autobiography. *The Story of My Experiments with Truth. By M. K. Gandhi. Translated from the original in Gujarati by Mahadev Desai. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 640 pp. $5.00.*

Hasidism. *By Martin Buber. New York: Philosophical Library. 208 pp. $3.75.*

Modern Man's Conflicts. *By Dane Rudhyar. New York: Philosophical Library. 228 pp. $3.75.*

Psychiatry and Religion. *Edited and with an Introduction by Joshua Loth Liebman. Boston: The Beacon Press. 202 pp. $3.00.*

Reconstruction of Humanity. *By Pitirim A. Sorokin. Boston: The Beacon Press. 247 pp. $3.00.*

Teachings of Swami Vivekananda. *Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama. 240 pp. Rs. 3/—.*

The Visitor and Hello Man. *By Kenneth L. Patton. Boston : The Beacon Press. 220 pp. $2.50.*

What Can We Believe? *By Vergilius Ferm. New York: Philosophical Library. 211 pp. $3.00.*

Correspondence

Thomas Paine Pulpit

To UNITY:

I have just gotten around to reading the July-August issue of your valued paper, and I find an article by John W. Cyrus on "How Free Is Free Religion?". In it he makes the following statement: "In the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago there is a pulpit which is named the Robert Ingersoll pulpit, because the great nineteenth century agnostic made a gift many years ago toward the purchase of a new pulpit for that Unitarian church." There are two misstatements of fact here.

In the first place, the pulpit of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago is named the Thomas Paine Pulpit; in the second place, Robert Ingersoll probably never heard of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago and hence he did not make a gift of a pulpit for that church. Ingersoll said he had "great respect for the Unitarian Church" because it had done much to civilize religion and because it believed "in a God who is a gentleman." Ingersoll contributed the proceeds of a Chicago lecture toward a statue of Thomas Paine, but since the statue did not materialize, the money (or some of it) was used many years later to defray the cost of the Thomas Paine pulpit of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago.

Sherman D. Wakefield.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

IOWA ASSOCIATION

The annual meeting of the Iowa Unitarian Association was held at Iowa City, October 18 to 20. The sessions were opened with the Judy Lecture on Monday evening. The lecture was given by Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, minister of the First Unitarian Society of Chicago. Rev. Philip Schug, of Lincoln, Nebraska, and Rev. Max Gaebler, of Davenport, spoke Tuesday morning. A part of the Tuesday morning program was a fifty-minute radio broadcast, on which Rev. Waldemar Argow, of Cedar Rapids and Vice-President of the Iowa Association, interviewed Dr. Frederick M. Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, and Rev. Randall S. Hilton, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference. Dean Lampe, of the University of Iowa School of Religion, introduced the program and was a participant.

The usual men's and women's luncheons were held Tuesday noon. The men were addressed by Dr. Eliot and the women by Mrs. Gilman Taylor, of Minneapolis. Following the Annual Dinner served at the church, Dr. Eliot addressed an open meeting of the Conference. Randall Hilton spoke Wednesday morning on Denominational Affairs.

The meetings closed with the final business session. Rev. Waldemar Argow was reëlected Vice-President and Rev. John W. Brigham, of Sioux City, was elected Secretary. The other officers of the Association are Mr. Roman Hruska, of Omaha, President; and Mr. Franklin Brown, of Des Moines, Treasurer.

MICHIGAN CONFERENCE

The Michigan-Toledo Unitarian Conference met on October 27 at the Grosse Pointe Unitarian Church. The morning sessions were devoted to the Alliance and to Unitarian affairs. Miss Lois McCulloch, Field Director of the General Alliance, led the Alliance section; and Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President of the Western Unitarian Conference, conducted the one on Unitarian polity and affairs.

Following the luncheon, served by the women of the Grosse Pointe church, and a brief business session, the Conference listened to two informative and inspiring addresses by Mrs. George W. Pieksen, President of the General Alliance, and Dr. Curtis W. Reese.

The Conference accepted the invitation to hold its next annual meeting at Toledo. Rev. Edward Redman, of Ann Arbor, was elected President.

DOCTOR DREIKURS

Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, who made such a sensational impact with his general lectures at Lake Geneva, has been kept busy by Unitarian groups ever since. Besides the two lectures he gave at the Minnesota Conference in September, he has given a series of three lectures at the Third Unitarian Church in Chicago. The result of this will probably be the establishment of a Community Child Guidance Clinic at the Third Church. He will be speaking at the Unitarian churches in Salt Lake City, Utah, and Berkeley, California, during December.

The second printing of Dr. Dreikurs' book, *The Challenge of Marriage,* is now off the press. Those who have orders in for copies will receive them soon.

ONE WORLD

As a part of the United Nations Week celebration in Chicago, the Free Religious Fellowship, our newest Unitarian church, presented the One World Ensemble at Orchestra Hall. The Ensemble was interracial and intercultural, consisting of persons from Negro, Nisei, English, American, and Jewish backgrounds. The program, which was well received, was also drawn from various sources. Dr. Preston Bradley led the audience in the Freedom Pledge during the intermission. A reception was held for the singers following the concert. The Free Religious Fellowship is to be congratulated on the successful conclusion of this gigantic undertaking. It was one of Chicago's most meaningful intercultural events of the year.

KENNETH PATTON

Rev. Kenneth L. Patton has resigned as minister of the Unitarian Church in Madison, Wisconsin. Mr. Patton will go to Boston the first of the year to undertake a pioneering project for the Massachusetts Universalist Convention. He will organize and be the minister of a Universalist-Humanist church. It will also provide an experimental laboratory for the Department of Education of the Universalist Church of America, of which Rev. Horton Colbert is Director. Mr. Colbert was formerly minister of the Universalist church in Rochester, Minnesota, and is well-known to many Geneva-goers. The new church will occupy the famous and historic Charles Street Meeting House. We are sorry to have Mr. Patton leave our Conference but we wish him all success and happiness in his new enterprise.

GRANT BUTLER

Rev. Grant A. Butler, formerly minister at Des Moines and now Minister-at-Large for the American Unitarian Association, spent six weeks this fall with the church in Duluth, Minnesota. He also visited the following Western Conference communities in the interests of Fellowship Units: Mankato, Minnesota; Ames, and Keokuk, Iowa; Hamilton, Illinois; and Yellow Springs, Ohio. Mr. and Mrs. Butler will spend the next few weeks in Norfolk, Virginia.

A. U. A. NOMINATIONS

The By-laws of the American Unitarian Association provide that the Board of Directors of the Association shall be the nominating committee for the officers of the Association. The November *Christian Register* announces that the Board has appointed a sub-committee to make recommendations to the Board at its meeting in January. Among the members of the committee is Mrs. George W. Pieksen, of St. Louis.

ANNUAL MEETINGS

The Board of Directors of the Western Unitarian Conference at its meeting, October 4, set the dates of May 6, 7, and 8, 1949, for the annual meetings of the Conference. They will be held at the People's Liberal Church in Chicago. Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President of the Western Conference, appointed the following program committee: Rev. William D. Hammond, Chairman; Randall S. Hilton, Edwin T. Buehrer, James Luther Adams, and Mrs. William Lyons.

CHICAGO UNITARIAN COUNCIL

At the annual meeting of the Chicago Unitarian Council, held November 11, the following officers were elected for the ensuing year: Mr. Howard Hauze, First Church, President; Rev. Lewis McGee, Free Religious Fellowship, Vice-President; Mrs. Lyle Lathrop, Beverly, Secretary; and Mrs. Ralph Hicks, Evanston, Treasurer. Dr. Charles Lyttle, retiring President, was made chairman of the committee on the completion of the Masaryk Memorial and the Council's delegate to the Citizens' Schools Committee. Dr. Homer A. Jack, minister at Evanston, is chairman of the publicity committee.

LOIS McCULLOCH

Miss Lois McCulloch, Field Representative of the General Alliance, is spending two months in the Western Conference area visiting Alliance branches. Among the places she is visiting are Detroit, Grosse Pointe, Duluth, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Sioux City, Omaha, Davenport, Quincy, Bloomington, Urbana, Shelbyville, and Chicago.

BEVERLY, CHICAGO

Rev. Helgi Borgford, whose resignation from the Beverly Unitarian Fellowship was announced in the last issue of UNITY, continues as its minister. This was a mutual reconsideration.

NEW ALLIANCE VICE-PRESIDENT

Mrs. Randall S. Hilton resigned as Midwest Regional Vice-President of the General Alliance in September. At the meeting of the General Alliance Board of Directors in October, Mrs. D. Gilman Taylor, of Minneapolis, was elected to fill the vacancy. Mrs. Taylor, prior to her elevation to the Vice-Presidency, was serving as Director for the Northern Division of the Region.

BOOKS

For a number of years the Western Conference office has maintained a bookstore as a service to the churches of the Conference. In spite of the fact that the Conference offers the same discounts obtainable through Boston and the increase in the number of churches operating book tables, there has been a sharp decline in the number of orders coming through the Conference. This raises the question as to whether this service is needed or desired. The expression of your opinion on this matter would be a helpful guide to your officers and to the Board.

Among the books which the Conference office has on hand and which are recommended as stimulating and provocative are:

AND SO YOU NEVER PRAY. *By Horace Westwood. Boston: Beacon Press. $1.75.*

This book has not received the notice and publicity which it deserves. It is challenging to both Theists and Humanists, and of equal interest to the clergy and laity.

WHAT IS NEW IN RELIGOUS EDUCATION? *By Raymond Johnson. Boston: Beacon Press. $1.50.*

Addressed primarily to parents and teachers, this book comes to grips with the perennial problem of using the Bible in the church school curriculum.

HOME FROM THE COLD WARS. *By Leslie Roberts. Boston: Beacon Press. $2.50.*

A Canadian correspondent reports on his experiences and observations in Europe on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

LAST CHANCE. *Edited by Clara Urquhart. Boston: Beacon Press. $2.50.*

A symposium dealing with our attitudes and crises in an Atomic Age.

THE CHALLENGE OF MARRIAGE. *By Rudolf Dreikurs. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce. $3.50.*

A competent psychiatrist discusses the problems of marriage in our modern culture. The second printing is now off the press and copies are available.

THE CHALLENGE OF PARENTHOOD. *By Rudolf Dreikurs. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce. $3.50.*

A natural follow-up of the book on marriage. Copies are now available.

THE VISITOR AND HELLO MAN. *By Kenneth Patton. Boston: Beacon Press. $2.50.*

A volume which includes new poems by Patton and his first and popular publication of poems. This is another book which has not received sufficient notice.

IF THOUGHT BE FREE. *By E. Burdette Backus. $1.00.*

A stimulating and valuable collection of thoughts by one of our soundest and most progressive thinkers.

BEYOND DOUBT. *By Kenneth Patton. Boston: Beacon Press. $2.00.*

A provocative collection of essays which underscore the affirmations of a naturalistic philosophy.

A TIMELY WARNING

In a recent radio broadcast, Walter Winchell warned of the pitfalls and dangers to democracy inherent in the proposed new Hopley Bill. If this bill should become law it would place the future and fortunes of the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press in the tender (?) care of the military. "It Can Happen Here!" An alert and aroused electorate must be ever-watchful and vocal.

SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Unitarian Service Committee has now become an autonomous corporate body. It is the hope of the Committee and its supporters that this will greatly increase its efficiency and usefulness. The Service Committee is remaining in the United Unitarian Appeal for the remainder of this year, at least.

UNITED APPEAL

It is impossible to overemphasize the importance of the success of the United Appeal. Earmarked contributions will be honored up to 100 per cent of the allocation of the participating organization designated. It is hoped that the churches and individual contributors will refrain from earmarking as much as possible, as such practices can work great hardships on other participating groups. The Western Unitarian Conference is a participating organization.

Order your Books through The Western Unitarian Conference